

MASS. ED14.2: R29/2



312066 0271 2926 9

REPORT OF THE
TASK FORCE ON CONTINUING EDUCATION

GRADUATE EDUCATION AT THE STATE COLLEGES

GOVERNMENT DOCUMENTS
COLLECTION

FEB 08 1988

University of Massachusetts
Depository Copy

MASSACHUSETTS BOARD OF REGENTS OF HIGHER EDUCATION

AUGUST 19, 1987

TASK FORCE MEMBERS

David Mundel, Chairman

Peter Birkel

Paul Eustace

Eileen Farley

John Gould

Mary Higgins

Anne McHugh

Margaret McKenna

S. Paul Reville

Sylvia Simmons

Ernest Therrien

Paul Weller

TASK FORCE ON CONTINUING EDUCATION

- AUGUST 19, 1987

GRADUATE EDUCATION AT THE STATE COLLEGES

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

In February, 1987, the Massachusetts Board of Regents of Higher Education "authorized and directed" the Chancellor to appoint a Task Force to review the role of Continuing Education programs in the Massachusetts public higher education system, and make appropriate recommendations for their reform. The Board had understood since its creation that Continuing Education was one of the most important issues on its agenda; now, responding to the call in Chancellor Franklyn G. Jenifer's "Year Ahead," it was prepared to address the issue directly. Once convened, the Task Force quickly identified State College graduate programs as a particular concern.

The Massachusetts State Colleges have granted graduate degrees for more than half a century. Graduate education is recognized as a fundamental part of their mission in the Regents' Long-Range Plan which calls for "a quality system of graduate education...available to everyone who seeks and who can benefit from graduate study." Today, the social and economic need for graduate programs is clear, as is the Commonwealth's responsibility to assure their accessibility and their quality. These programs provide advanced skills for individuals employed in many of the vital private industries of the Commonwealth and provide additional expertise to professionals in such public sector fields as social work, nursing, and education.

While these programs represent in many respects a successful adaptation of traditional academic forms to a changing world, they fall short of their potential. Scores of consultants and accreditation teams have pointed to serious difficulties, particularly in the areas of program cohesiveness, student services, and academic support. In the judgment of critics they lack consistent quality because they operate without full-time faculty regularly assigned and without sufficient support to assure continuity and to provide academic and student services.

The single most important reason contributing to these weaknesses is the absence of state support. The legislation creating the Board of Regents requires public colleges and universities to conduct summer sessions and evening classes "at no expense to the Commonwealth." Courses and programs offered after five o'clock in the evening (with certain exceptions) are conducted on a self-supporting basis through Divisions of Continuing Education. These include all of the graduate programs at the State Colleges, as well as some at Southeastern Massachusetts University.

When continuing education began, it was assumed that day students were full-time students and evening students were part-time students, holding daytime jobs. Today, however, it is common for students of all ages to mix work and school, whether they enroll in the day or evening programs; some attend school part-time, others full-time. Thus the State Colleges serve students on varying schedules but are forced to treat evening students less than equitably long after the original rationale is gone.

A state that offers quality education to its citizens cannot afford to assume that its responsibility ends with the baccalaureate degree, or when the student becomes a participant in the workforce. The State College graduate programs provide opportunities for professional advancement, yet the basis on which they are conducted does not fulfill the state's responsibility, or represent its best interest.

There is, first of all, a basic state interest in the integrity of higher education programs offered within our borders and to our citizens. Moreover, there is a general commitment to provide programs of quality through the public colleges and universities; this concern weighs all the more heavily because these programs are the most advanced offered in the State Colleges. Finally, to the extent that many of these programs train workers in public service fields, the Commonwealth has a more direct interest in their quality as well as their accessibility.

Since broad access is a fundamental goal of public graduate programs, financial aid should be available to students enrolled in them. Students in self-supporting programs are excluded from the Massachusetts Graduate Scholarship Program. Moreover, there are insufficient funds in the program to support even those in independent and state-supported programs who are eligible. The state is best served by insuring that both full-time and part-time students in both the independent and public sectors are eligible for need-based scholarships. Tuition waivers should be used as supplements to these scholarships and as support for graduate students employed as research, teaching, or administrative assistants.

The goal should be rigorous and accessible undergraduate liberal arts and professional programs, together with selected masters programs of equivalent quality and accessibility. These graduate programs should meet public need by training their students, especially working professionals, in a range of fields, with full academic and support services. The graduate programs must be selected, organized and funded so as to strengthen the undergraduate curriculum, not divert attention and resources from it. At the graduate as at the undergraduate level, the Colleges will stress instructional quality, rather than research; but their faculties should have increased incentives and opportunities to pursue research, participate in professional activities, and remain current in their fields.

SUMMARY OF MAJOR RECOMMENDATIONS

Our basic recommendation is that selected graduate programs in the Massachusetts public higher education system should be state-supported. To this end, we propose the following steps:

- o Graduate education should be freed from the statutory limitation which may preclude state support of evening, weekend, and summer courses.
- o No new self-supporting graduate programs -- that is, programs which are not offered on a state-supported basis -- shall be initiated or approved.
- o All self-supporting graduate programs in the public higher education system shall be either "converted" to state support or phased out; in some cases, program consolidation within or among institutions may facilitate phase-out.
- o The Regents shall develop a statewide plan for graduate education, establishing within it general standards and guidelines for graduate programs.
- o The State Colleges shall emphasize graduate programs adapted to the needs of part-time working students
- o In order to assure that evening students have access to cohesive programs of high quality, full state-supported services, and regular faculty, collective bargaining agreements should permit assignment of faculty and staff to day or evening graduate courses as part of their regular teaching load, with appropriate safeguards of their rights.

TASK FORCE ON CONTINUING EDUCATION

AUGUST 19, 1987

GRADUATE EDUCATION AT THE STATE COLLEGES

INTRODUCTION

In February, 1987, the Massachusetts Board of Regents of Higher Education "authorized and directed" the Chancellor to appoint a Task Force to review the role of Continuing Education programs in the Massachusetts public higher education system, and make appropriate recommendations for their reform. The Board had understood since its creation that Continuing Education was one of the most important issues on its agenda; now, responding to the call in Chancellor Franklyn G. Jenifer's "Year Ahead," it was prepared to address the issue directly.

Once convened, the Task Force quickly identified State College graduate programs as an area of particular concern. Though smaller than the other two components of Continuing Education -- non-credit offerings and part-time, evening versions of undergraduate programs -- the graduate programs pose distinct and pressing problems.

The Massachusetts State Colleges have granted graduate degrees for more than half a century. Graduate education is recognized as a fundamental part of their mission in the Regents' Long-Range Plan which calls for "a quality system of graduate education...available to everyone who seeks and who can benefit from graduate study." Today, the social and economic need for graduate programs is clear, as is the Commonwealth's responsibility to assure their accessibility and their quality. These programs provide advanced skills for individuals employed in many of the vital private industries of the Commonwealth and provide additional expertise to professionals in such public sector fields as social work, nursing, and education.

While these programs represent in many respects a successful adaptation of traditional academic forms to a changing world, they fall short of their potential. Scores of consultants and accreditation teams have pointed to serious difficulties, particularly in the areas of program cohesiveness, student services, and academic support. In the judgment of critics they lack consistent quality because they operate without full-time faculty regularly assigned and without sufficient support to assure continuity and to provide academic and student services.

The single most important reason contributing to these weaknesses is the absence of state support. The legislation creating the Board of Regents requires public colleges and universities to conduct summer sessions and evening classes "at no expense to the Commonwealth." Courses and programs offered after five o'clock in the evening (with certain exceptions) are conducted on a self-supporting basis through Divisions of Continuing Education. These include all of the graduate programs at the State Colleges, as well as some at Southeastern Massachusetts University.

It should be understood that state support in the context of the public system is not simply a matter of money. Because self-supporting programs must be run through Continuing Education, they have an anomalous status within each of the Colleges; they are literally separated out from what the college considers its regular programs. In a setting where public funding is the norm and state rules and contracts provide the basic personnel structure, state support connotes equal status for programs, faculty, administrators and for students as well. Lack of support connotes less than equal status and results in less than equal attention.

In response to the broad-ranging criticism of this financing system, the Task Force initiated a careful review of graduate programs in the State Colleges. To better understand the variations and complexities of graduate offerings in the public baccalaureate colleges, the Task Force reviewed, in detail, examples at Worcester State College and Salem State College. It also listened to presentations made by representatives of both of these colleges and from the President of the Massachusetts State College Association (the faculty's collective bargaining unit). The Chairman and staff members of the Task Force met with four State College Presidents to discuss the work of the Task Force and to hear their views on existing conditions and the steps necessary to remedy those conditions. In addition, the Chairman and staff members discussed the issue with the Executive Committee of the Association of Independent Colleges and Universities in Massachusetts (AICUM).

This report is a detailed review of the particular circumstances that led to the existing conditions in our baccalaureate institutions; the problems that these existing conditions have fostered; standards for comparable programs throughout the United States; and, finally, the state's responsibility to support graduate education. As a result of its analysis, the Task Force has developed a set of specific recommendations which are summarized at the end of this report.

HISTORY OF STATE COLLEGE GRADUATE PROGRAMS

The history of the State College graduate programs illuminates both their distinctive character and their current problems. The Massachusetts State Colleges were founded in the nineteenth century as Normal Schools -- the first such institutions in the nation -- to prepare young women and men for the teaching profession. In the 1920's, now known as State Teachers Colleges, they began awarding bachelor's degrees in Education and soon, as the demands of the profession increased, the Master of Education as well. When, in the 1960's, they became State Colleges with the authority to grant degrees in the liberal arts and in career fields other than Education, they added new masters programs in a number of fields, such as Administration, Food Science, and English. Though its scope widened, graduate education at the State Colleges generally retained a very practical orientation, firmly rooted in the career needs of working professionals in the community.

Historically the students who entered the Master of Education programs at the State Colleges were primarily elementary and high school teachers who wished to upgrade their skills and incomes. Over time, teachers' employment contracts provided a strong incentive for graduate study -- the masters degree became a credential which brought a higher salary. Students who enrolled in the newer non-Education professional programs were similarly motivated by both a desire to gain knowledge and a need to gain a credential to achieve professional advancement.

These students were not the "traditional" graduate students, willing to "go away" to school and enroll full-time. Rather, they were working professionals who needed to attend a local college part-time. In response to these students, the State Colleges scheduled classes in the evening hours, and allowed students to enroll part-time.

Since these students were employed, it was perceived that the Commonwealth should not have to subsidize their graduate education. Thus, programs were to be run "at no cost to the Commonwealth," in Divisions of Continuing Education (DCE).

Under these circumstances, the programs naturally evolved with particular strengths and weaknesses. Because of their reliance on tuition revenues, these programs concentrated in fields in which there is a high demand among working college graduates for further professional education. The design of the programs is aimed at this constituency, with a commendable emphasis on accessibility and convenience. However, for several reasons the degree of concern with academic quality has not always been commensurate with the concern for access and convenience. Regrettably, students have often been content with convenient classes and an acceptable credential. Within the institutions, the self-supporting status has meant "second-class" standing, chronic underfunding and consequent difficulty in maintaining continuity and mounting higher-cost programs.

CURRENT SITUATION

Today graduate education is a recognized and increasingly important aspect of the State College mission, despite its separate status and its resulting problems. While the majority of graduate programs are still in Education, the State Colleges now offer a variety of master's degrees designed for professionals who work in the middle to upper-middle levels of the Massachusetts economy. In particular, Administration and Business have become popular offerings. There are also some specialized programs that have evolved because of the particular strengths of a faculty, in combination with a serious regional need for workers trained in that area. (An example of this is the Speech Pathology program at Worcester State College.)

Currently, there are approximately 3800 matriculated students in continuing education graduate programs in the State Colleges (see Appendix A), with many more students enrolled on a non-matriculated basis. Approximately two-thirds of the students are women, with an average age of about thirty. The great majority of these graduate students are employed. (This information is based on "best estimates" from administrators in these programs.)

There is no standard structure for administering graduate continuing education programs. Nationally, the chief academic officer of an institution, reporting directly to the President, is responsible for the quality of all academic programs. Other academic administrators report to the chief academic officer, including the individual whose primary responsibility is graduate education. While this is the case in some State Colleges, in others the Dean of Graduate and Continuing Education, whose programs are financially autonomous, reports directly to the President. However, in order to maintain the academic integrity of the graduate programs, as well as the college as a whole, it is preferable for the Dean of Graduate and Continuing Education to report directly to the Academic Vice President.

Hiring faculty in continuing education graduate programs is generally the responsibility of the the Dean of Graduate and Continuing Education, in conjunction with the chairpersons of the day-division, state-supported departments. Since the programs are self-supporting and tuition rates are modest, strategies to hold costs down are a necessity. As a result, professors are hired to teach per course in the graduate programs. Regular faculty from the day division often have first preference, either as part of their regular course load, or more often on an overload basis. The majority of courses are staffed with adjunct faculty hired from outside the college. Frequently these faculty are hired only to teach a particular course; they are not required to assist in program development or to participate in institutional and professional activities.

The Regents and the Colleges themselves have both recognized the growing importance of graduate education, and taken a number of steps to improve its quality. As noted above, on several campuses graduate education is now under the control of the chief academic officer rather than a dean or director of Continuing Education. In certain instances, regular advising and other services are available to evening part-time students. Graduate courses are sometimes treated as part of the regular faculty load. However, the movement toward integrating graduate and undergraduate resources in ways that each can strengthen and reinforce the other has been halting and awkward given the existing statutory limitations, funding constraints, and irregular status of the programs within the Colleges.

PROBLEMS IN EXISTING PROGRAMS

For at least a decade, review and accrediting bodies have raised serious questions about the quality of self-supporting graduate programs. Peer reviewers have stated unequivocally that high-quality programs cannot operate separately from the regular day-division. (See Appendix B). Charles Cook, Director of the Commission on Institutions of Higher Education at the New England Association of Schools and Colleges, summarized the situation recently:

Over the past twelve years the Commission's visiting committees, evaluating these institutions for continuing accreditation, have almost uniformly cited concerns about graduate education. More specifically, weaknesses have been identified in such areas as the credentials of the faculty, the need to encourage and support scholarly activity, the inadequacy of library resources, a variety of problems resulting from graduate courses being taught on an overload basis, the absence of adequate academic oversight, the lack of appropriate planning, and the need for greater academic support services.

The most significant difficulty is that the faculty teaching in the Continuing Education graduate programs do not do so as regularly employed, fully committed professionals. At least in practice, most faculty are hired only to teach courses; all the other functions inherent in running a graduate program have not received the attention they need. As a result, the following problems exist:

- A lack of curriculum planning and program development.
- Academic advising is limited, as professors may not be required to have office hours.
- Weak professional development among the faculty; there are no incentives or support for faculty to be active in professional organizations, publish, or do research.
- Limited course offerings. A student may be unable to plan the course of her degree because of the unpredictable nature of course offerings in DCE.

Other problems in graduate programs stem from a lack of institutional resources. Some examples are:

--Career counseling is often weak or nonexistent.

--Weak library and equipment resources in areas relevant to the graduate programs.

DCE graduate students also suffer from a more direct inequity in the financial aid system. Massachusetts graduate students, enrolled full- or part-time, are generally eligible for need-based financial aid through the state's Graduate Scholarship Grant Program. These grants support students at independent colleges and universities, and those enrolled in state-supported graduate programs. However, the guidelines specifically exclude from eligibility students in self-supporting (DCE) public programs. In addition, it is clear that there is not enough financial aid to support even those who are presently eligible. Any extension of financial aid to State College students will certainly require additional funding.

NATIONAL STANDARDS FOR GRADUATE PROGRAMS

Over the last twenty years, the master's degree has experienced a dramatic increase in importance and popularity. This reflects the growing number of occupations in modern society that require training beyond the bachelor's degree. Peterson's Guide to Graduate Study lists over six hundred distinct titles for master's degrees. There are, for example, Masters of Building Construction, Dental Hygiene Education, Pollution Control, Hospital Management, and a wide variety of Master's in Education.

This proliferation of master's degree programs is a comparatively recent phenomenon, and it has been accompanied by a lack of precision about qualitative standards. Besides lack of tradition, quality control is made difficult by the absence of the direct competitive processes that exist at the doctoral level. The Ph.D. is a long-established degree, and doctoral programs have been ranked nationally for more than sixty years, most recently by the Conference Board of Associated Research Councils (1982). Here reputation is based on scholarly productivity, validated by publications in refereed journals and receipt of peer-reviewed grants. Recent graduates of the better programs compete in the national job market, adding a further dimension to the comparison.

In contrast, master's degree programs which train individuals for professional occupations often lack well-established standards. Research, where it exists, is applied rather than theoretical; it rarely leads to publication in journals with a national reputation. The institutions which sponsor such programs are, more often than not, without a solid tradition of graduate instruction to guide them in introducing new programs. The programs are established in response to perceived or real societal needs, and their curricula are heavily influenced by immediate marketplace demands.

Accreditation standards do exist in some fields, but the standards are far from universally accepted. Neither state agencies nor regional accrediting associations require that degree programs be accredited in the discipline or field of study in which the degree is offered. For example, neither the Board of Regents nor the New England Association of Colleges and Schools require professional accreditation as a condition for their approval of programs and institutions.

It is also true that accreditation standards in fields of disciplines vary from the very strict (e.g., Social Work) to the relatively weak (e.g., Teacher Education). Some new fields lack any accreditation standards or have only begun to establish such standards (e.g., Computer Science). Finally, there is justifiable criticism of some accreditation standards as bureaucratic or unduly intrusive on institutional autonomy. The criticism has allowed some colleges to argue that accreditation does not mean anything and that their definition of quality has as much merit as those offered by an accreditation agency.

It should be emphasized that these comments apply to master's programs nationally and not simply to Massachusetts. The unique practice of including graduate education as part of continuing education in the Commonwealth simply compounds the problem, as is discussed elsewhere in this paper.

Despite the absence of agreed upon standards, most educators would agree that there are some general guidelines applicable to the master's programs under consideration:

--A core of full-time faculty teaching in the graduate program. All graduate faculty should have terminal degrees. The faculty would be expected to do curriculum development and program planning. The teaching load should allow the faculty time to participate in professional activities, and publish if desired.

--Part-time faculty should not teach more than 40% of the courses. The National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education states that the use of part-timers should be "limited,...not excessive." The standards of the American Assembly of Collegiate Schools of Business state "the number of full-time faculty shall be at least 75% of the FTE faculty required."

--A clear organizational structure, including an individual who will oversee: the admission of applicants to graduate programs; the review of their academic progress; the awarding of scholarships and coordinating all financial aid for graduate students; the administration of internships, general examinations, and theses; the certification of the completion of degree requirements and recommending granting of the degree; and the adequacy of student services and promoting the welfare of graduate students.

--A well-structured and rigorous program, providing students with up-to-date training in their field. The department should offer, on a regular basis, all of the courses required to complete the program.

--Graduate programs should build upon, and reinforce, the strengths of related undergraduate programs. A high quality undergraduate program is a prerequisite to starting a graduate program, unless the program is in a new field where undergraduate instruction does not exist.

--An admissions process which assures that all entering students are capable of fulfilling the graduate degree requirements. Students should have adequate undergraduate training and may be required to take the appropriate graduate admissions examination.

--Library resources, equipment and facilities should be sufficient to provide students with the most up-to-date training in their field.

--Courses and programs must be approved by the college's governing structure.

--Support services for the students, (such as career advising, financial aid, and academic advising) should be available to all graduate students, including part-time, evening students.

--Colleges should only offer programs that are an integral part of their mission.

THE RESPONSIBILITY OF THE COMMONWEALTH

The Board of Regents' Long Range Plan for Public Higher Education in Massachusetts calls for "a quality system of graduate education...available to everyone who seeks and who can benefit from graduate study," one that will "assure men and women from every sector of society an opportunity to seek preparation for leadership roles." The Long Range Plan distinguishes between research-oriented graduate programs and professionally-oriented programs which offer master's-level preparation in career fields such as business administration, teaching, and social work. Such professional programs are explicitly and intrinsically a part of the mission of the State Colleges, and an increasingly important aspect of their role within the higher education system.

The Long Range Plan notes that:

High quality professionally-oriented programs are important to the state. They provide advanced education for secondary teachers, for professionals in industry, for people in state and local government agencies and for managers in many of our

industrial and business concerns. The availability of this type of graduate education can be crucial, as professions become more demanding, mirroring the increasing complexity of society itself. There will continue to be a need for practice-oriented programs at the graduate level at all public colleges and universities.

It is, therefore, "in the interest of the state to support graduate education, particularly in those areas of economic importance." Beyond the direct contributions of graduate training, these programs have significant institutional benefits, by maintaining the integrity and depth of baccalaureate programs, infusing new ideas, and expanding instructional capabilities.

When DCE began, it was assumed that day students were full-time students, and evening students were part-time students, holding day-time jobs. Today, however, it is common for students of all ages to mix work and school, whether they enroll in the day or evening programs; some attend school part-time, others full-time. Thus, the State Colleges serve students on varying schedules, but are forced to treat evening students less than equitably long after the original rationale is gone.

Similarly, many professional fields now demand advanced training and continuing professional education to maintain practitioners' competence. A state that offers quality education to its citizens cannot afford to assume that its responsibility ends with the baccalaureate degree, or when the student becomes a participant in the workforce. The State College graduate programs provide opportunities for professional advancement, yet the basis on which they are conducted does not fulfill the state's responsibility, or represent its best interest.

There is, first of all, a basic state interest in the integrity of higher education programs offered within our borders and to our citizens. Moreover, there is a general commitment to provide programs of quality through the public colleges and universities; this concern weighs all the more heavily because these master's degree programs are the most advanced offered in the State Colleges. Finally, to the extent that many of these programs train workers in public service fields, the Commonwealth has a direct interest in their quality as well as their accessibility.

Within the existing statutory framework, the Regents could recommend funding for State College graduate programs conducted during the day. This would meet many of the salient quality issues that now concern us. Indeed the Food Science program at Framingham, supported on this basis, has been recognized as a "center of excellence;" and the formerly self-supporting graduate programs at the University of Lowell have all gained accreditation. Unfortunately, this approach would sacrifice one of the distinctive strengths of most of these programs: their accessibility for those students who hold day-time jobs. Only repeal of the legislation barring state support of evening programs will free the State Colleges to fulfill their established and invaluable graduate mission while meeting appropriate standards of quality.

Since broad access is a fundamental goal of public graduate programs, financial aid should be available to students enrolled in them. This is not presently the case. Students in self-supporting programs are excluded from the Massachusetts Graduate Scholarship Program, a need-based program which provides up to \$2000 annually to public-system students. Part-time students in state-supported programs are eligible for aid, if their institution offers some graduate programs on a full-time basis. The state is best served by insuring that both full-time and part-time students are eligible for need-based scholarships. Tuition waivers should be used as supplements to these scholarships and as support for graduate students employed as research, teaching or administrative assistants.

* * * * *

In 1982, the Long Range Plan called upon the Board of Regents to "formulate a specific plan to support the development of high-quality practice-oriented graduate programs." Wherever possible, these programs should be structured to accommodate the needs and schedules of the older, employed students who are now seeking graduate opportunities in growing numbers. To assure efficient use of public funds, they should be limited to "fields of sufficient demand to justify the commitment of faculty and other resources;" interdisciplinary, inter-institutional, and consortial approaches should be sought; and duplication of traditional disciplinary programs should be avoided.

Today, five years later, the social and economic need for graduate education is clearer than ever. So too is its place in the mission of our State Colleges, and its potential benefit to the overall academic strength of these institutions. To allow these graduate programs to remain formally outside the regular academic structure and without direct state funding, and to tolerate a situation, in which an entire level of degree programs -- the highest offered by these institutions -- is relegated to second-class status, is simply unacceptable.

The goal should be rigorous and accessible undergraduate liberal arts and professional programs, together with selected masters programs of equivalent quality and accessibility. These graduate programs should meet public need by training their students, especially working professionals, in a range of fields, with full academic and support services. The graduate programs must be selected, organized and funded so as to strengthen the undergraduate curriculum, not divert attention and resources from it. At the graduate as at the undergraduate level, the Colleges will stress instructional quality, rather than research; but their faculties should have increased incentives and opportunities to pursue research, participate in professional activities, and remain current in their fields.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Our basic recommendation is that the practice of conducting graduate programs on a self-supporting basis be ended in the Massachusetts public higher education system, and that selected graduate programs be state-supported. To this end, we propose the following steps:

- o The Regents and the Commonwealth shall, as a matter of policy, recognize State College graduate programs as an appropriate and necessary sphere of state support.
- o Graduate education should be freed from the statutory limitation which may preclude state support of evening, weekend, and summer courses.
- o No new self-supporting graduate programs -- that is, programs which are not offered on a state-supported basis -- shall be initiated or approved.
- o All self-supporting graduate programs in the public higher education system shall be either "converted" to state support or phased out; in some cases, program consolidation within or among institutions may facilitate phase-out.
- o The Regents shall develop a statewide plan for graduate education in the public higher education system, within which specific programmatic decisions may be addressed. This plan shall include a review of tuition policy for graduate programs with consideration of the appropriate shares of the cost of education to be borne by the Commonwealth and the students, respectively. It shall also address the need for various types of programs (including field, structure, and schedule), and their geographic and financial accessibility, while taking into account the availability of quality programs at independent colleges and universities.
- o The Regents' plan shall include general standards and guidelines for graduate programs; while these standards may vary by field, at a minimum they shall include the following:
 - Evidence that individual programs build upon and reinforce the strengths of related undergraduate programs;
 - Coherent admissions criteria that are related to the demands and requirements within individual programs;
 - A well-structured curriculum in each program that reflects planning and program development;
 - A core of full-time faculty with teaching and advising duties in each program;
 - Opportunities for professional development among the faculty;
 - Adequate provision for library resources, equipment (e.g., computer terminals), and facilities;
 - Support sources (advising, financial aid) should be available at hours congruent with student class hours.

- o Following the adoption of the Regents' plan, each State College shall prepare and submit to the Board of Regents a plan for the future of its graduate programs, including the following elements:
 - a general long-range strategy and plan sketching out future goals for graduate education on the campus;
 - evaluation of existing graduate programs in terms of public need and centrality to mission;
 - evaluation of existing programs in terms of applicable standards of quality, including both current status and prospects for improvement, if necessary;
 - proposal for "conversion" to state-support, or phase-out, of each existing program;
 - estimate of the cost of state support for each program proposed for continuation, and of institutional resources available for reallocation;
 - a plan for implementation and conversion and/or phase-out, with clear objectives and standards;
 - a plan for faculty and staff development designed to strengthen the institution's capabilities at the graduate level;
 - a plan for provision of academic support and student services to graduate students, whether enrolled in day or evening programs.
- o Graduate programs shall be under the control of the chief academic officer of each campus, and subject to the same institutional and departmental processes as other state-supported programs.
- o The State Colleges shall emphasize graduate programs adapted to the needs of part-time working students.
- o In order to assure that evening students have access to cohesive programs of high quality, full state-supported services, and regular faculty, collective bargaining agreements should permit assignment of faculty and staff to day or evening graduate courses as part of their regular teaching load, with appropriate safeguards of their rights.
- o Need-based financial aid should assure access and choice in higher education to Massachusetts residents at the graduate as well as the undergraduate level, whether they enroll full-time or part-time. Graduate students in all programs, whether in public or independent institutions, should be eligible for the Massachusetts Graduate Scholarship Program, or other applicable financial aid program. Every effort should be made to provide full financial aid information and services to all prospective graduate students, including part-time students.

APPENDIX A

MATRICULATED GRADUATE ENROLLMENTS

Matriculated Graduate Enrollments

STATE COLLEGE: TOTAL

HC = Headcount

FTE = Full-Time Equivalent

<u>Enrollments</u>	<u>Fall, 1984</u> <u>HC/FTE</u>	<u>Fall, 1985</u> <u>HC/FTE</u>	<u>Fall, 1986</u> <u>HC/FTE</u>
Bridgewater	418/154	498/196	603/240
Fitchburg	629/154	758/235	634/222
Framingham	453/195	468/201	470/202
Mass. College of Art	67/67	67/67	72/72
North Adams		50/	50/
Salem			361/
Westfield	197/52	271/72	236/63
Worcester	922/	686/	<u>751/</u>
<u>TOTAL</u>			3177/

<u>Graduates</u> (by calendar year)	<u>1984</u>	<u>1985</u>	<u>1986</u>
Bridgewater	136	151	188
Fitchburg	117	110	103
Framingham	125	122	107
Mass. College of Art	14	25	22
North Adams		21	21
Salem	78	67	71
Westfield	54	51	83
Worcester	<u>154</u>	<u>165</u>	<u>163</u>
<u>TOTAL</u>		712	758

Matriculated Graduate Enrollments

STATE COLLEGE: Bridgewater

HC = Headcount FTE = Full-Time Equivalent (12 credits = 1 FTE)

<u>Enrollments</u>	<u>Fall, 1984</u> <u>HC/FTE</u>	<u>Fall, 1985</u> <u>HC/FTE</u>	<u>Fall, 1986</u> <u>HC/FTE</u>
M.A.	23/8	48/19	53/21
M.A., Teaching	44/15	45/13	26/8
M.Ed.	246/96	293/121	353/144
M.S.	15/5	11/3	19/7
C.A.G.S.*	<u>90/30</u>	<u>101/40</u>	<u>152/60</u>
<u>TOTAL</u>	418/154	498/196	603/240

<u>Graduates</u> (by calendar year)	<u>1984</u>	<u>1985</u>	<u>1986</u>
M.A.	6	6	7
M.A.T.	17	14	15
M.Ed.	94	107	136
M.S.	3	7	5
C.A.G.S.*	<u>16</u>	<u>17</u>	<u>25</u>
<u>TOTAL</u>	136	151	188

*C.A.G.S. = Certificate of Advanced Graduate Study

Matriculated Graduate Enrollments

STATE COLLEGE: Fitchburg

HC = Headcount

FTE = Full-Time Equivalent

<u>Enrollments</u>	<u>Fall, 1984</u> <u>HC/FTE</u>	<u>Fall, 1985</u> <u>HC/FTE</u>	<u>Fall, 1986</u> <u>HC/FTE</u>
M.S., Computer Science	36/	45/	46/
M.S., Management	44/	49/	50/
M.S., Counseling	95/	105/	78/
M.S., Comm./Media	4/	22/	28/
MAT, English	13/	15/	17/
M.Ed., Elem. Ed.	106/	113/	76/
M.Ed., Secondary Ed.	82/	107/	90/
M.Ed., Special Ed.	140/	171/	152/
M.Ed., Occup. Ed.	80/	88/	62/
M.Ed., Leadership	<u>29/</u>	<u>35/</u>	<u>35/</u>
<u>TOTAL</u>	629/154	750/235	634/222

<u>Graduate</u> (by calendar year)	<u>1984</u>	<u>1985</u>	<u>1986</u>
M.S., Computer Science	3	3	10
M.S., Management	-	-	New Program
M.S., Counseling	8	13	11
M.S., Comm./Media	3	1	-
M.A.T., English	-	-	-
M.Ed.	<u>103</u>	<u>93</u>	<u>82</u>
<u>TOTAL</u>	117	110	103

Framingham State College
 Arnold Good

<u>Enrollments</u>	<u>1984</u> <u>HC/FTE</u>	<u>1985</u> <u>HC/FTE</u>	<u>1986</u> <u>HC/FTE</u>
M.A., Administration	251/108	170/116.1	276/118.7
M.A., Counseling	71/30.5	88/37.8	92/39.9
M.Ed.	86/36.9	81/34.8	71/30.5
M.S., Food Services	<u>45/19.3</u>	<u>29/12.5</u>	<u>30/12.9</u>
<u>TOTAL</u>	453/195	468/201	470/202

<u>Graduates</u>	<u>1984</u>	<u>1985</u>	<u>1986</u>
M.A., Administration	64	67	65
M.A., Counseling	27	12	13
M.Ed.	25	26	15
M.S., Food Services	<u>9</u>	<u>17</u>	<u>14</u>
<u>TOTAL</u>	125	122	107

M.Ed. - moratorium, no new students.

Matriculated Graduate Enrollments

STATE COLLEGE: Mass. College of Art

HC = Headcount

FTE = Full-Time Equivalent

<u>Enrollments</u>	<u>Fall, 1984</u> <u>HC/FTE</u>	<u>Fall, 1985</u> <u>HC/FTE</u>	<u>Fall, 1986</u> <u>HC/FTE</u>
M.F.A.	47/47	50/50	54/54
M.S., Art Ed.	<u>20/20</u>	<u>17/17</u>	<u>18/18</u>
<u>TOTAL</u>	67/67	67/67	72/72

<u>Graduates</u> (by calendar year)	<u>1984</u>	<u>1985</u>	<u>1986</u>
M.F.A.	7	19	19
M.S., Art Ed.	<u>7</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>3</u>
<u>TOTAL</u>	14	25	22

Other Notes: Average age is approximately 27
in the MFA program it's 50/50 men and women,
in the Art Education program there's a higher
percentage of women.

—

HC = Headcount

FTE = Full-Time Equivalent

<u>Enrollments</u>	<u>Fall, 1984</u> <u>HC/FTE</u>	<u>Fall, 1985</u> <u>HC/FTE</u>	<u>Fall, 1986</u> <u>HC/FTE</u>
M.Ed.		50/	50/
<u>TOTAL</u>		50/	50/

<u>Graduates</u> (by calendar year)	<u>1984</u>	<u>1985</u>	<u>1986</u>
M.Ed.		21	22
<u>TOTAL</u>		21	22

General Student Profile: Average age = 30
2/3 of students are women.

Matriculated Graduate Enrollments

STATE COLLEGE: Salem

HC = Headcount

FTE = Full-Time Equivalent

<u>Enrollments</u>	<u>Fall, 1984</u> <u>HC/FTE</u>	<u>Fall, 1985</u> <u>HC/FTE</u>	<u>Fall, 1986</u> <u>HC/FTE</u>
M.A., English			9/
M.A., History			8/
M.B.A.			99/
M.S., Mathematics			4/
M.S., Nursing			80/
M.Ed., Administration			17/
M.Ed., Sch. & Comm. Counseling			108/
M.Ed., Early Childhood			9/
M.Ed., Elementary			3/
M.Ed., Reading			<u>24/</u>
<u>TOTAL</u>			361/

<u>Graduates</u> (by calendar year)	<u>1984</u>	<u>1985</u>	<u>1986</u>
M.A., English	4	1	5
M.A., History	2	1	4
M.A., Teaching	1	0	0
M.S., Math	0	1	0
M.B.A.	0	4	3
M.S., Nursing	0	4	14
M.Ed., Scho. & Comm. Con.	32	38	22
M.Ed., Early Childhood	4	4	11
M.Ed., Elementary	18	0	1
M.Ed., Reading	<u>17</u>	<u>14</u>	<u>11</u>
<u>TOTAL</u>	78	67	71

General Student Profile: female age 25-40, lives within 10 miles of campus, earns \$15-20,000/year.

Matriculated Graduate Enrollments

STATE COLLEGE: Westfield

HC = Headcount

FTE = Full-Time Equivalent

<u>Enrollments</u>	<u>Fall, 1984</u> <u>HC/FTE</u>	<u>Fall, 1985</u> <u>HC/FTE</u>	<u>Fall, 1986</u> <u>HC/FTE</u>
M.A., English	10/2.6	11/2.9	11/2.9
M.A., Psychology	17/4.5	18/4.8	25/6.6
M.S., Criminal Justice	22/5.8	36/9.6	33/8.8
M.Ed., Education	129/34.4	182/48.5	145/38.7
C.A.G.S.*	<u>19/5.0</u>	<u>24/6.4</u>	<u>22/5.8</u>
<u>TOTAL</u>	197/52	271/72	236/63

Note: 2/3 of enrolled students were female; 1/3 male, for Fall, 1986.

<u>Graduates</u> (by calendar year)	<u>1984</u>	<u>1985</u>	<u>1986</u>
M.A., English	1	0	4
M.A., Psychology	5	3	9
M.S., Criminal Justice	3	14	15
M.Ed., Education	43	26	50
C.A.G.S.*	<u>2</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>5</u>
<u>TOTAL</u>	54	51	83

C.A.G.S. = Certificate of Advanced Graduate Study

Matriculated Graduate Enrollments

STATE COLLEGE: Worcester

HC = Headcount

FTE = Full-Time Equivalent

<u>Enrollments</u>	<u>Fall, 1984</u> <u>HC/FTE</u>	<u>Fall, 1985</u> <u>HC/FTE</u>	<u>Fall, 1986</u> <u>HC/FTE</u>
M.Ed.	525/	390/	481/
M.S., Biology	12/	8/	16/
M.S., Speech Pathology	128/	73/	68/
M.S., Human Srv. Mgt.	50/	59/	59/
M.S., Applied Math	112/	106/	92/
C.A.G.S., Education	<u>95/</u>	<u>50/</u>	<u>35/</u>
<u>TOTAL</u>	922/	686/	751/

<u>Graduates</u> (by calendar year)	<u>1984</u>	<u>1985</u>	<u>1986</u>
M.Ed.	109	99	109
M.S., Biology	1	4	2
M.S., Speech Pathology	12	22	19
M.S., Human Srv. Mgt.	10	9	12
M.S., Applied Math	10	20	16
C.A.G.S., Education	<u>12</u>	<u>11</u>	<u>5</u>
<u>TOTAL</u>	154	165	163

APPENDIX B
Program Reviews

EXCERPTS FROM ACCREDITING ASSOCIATION LETTER,
AND BUSINESS, NURSING, AND TEACHING REVIEWS

1. Excerpt from Charles Cook, Director, Commission on Institutions of Higher Education, New England Association of Schools and Colleges - October 28, 1986:

Over the past twelve years the Commission's visiting committees, evaluating these institutions for continuing accreditation, have almost uniformly cited concerns about graduate education. More specifically, weaknesses have been identified in such areas as the credentials of the faculty, the need to encourage and support scholarly activity, the inadequacy of library resources, a variety of problems resulting from graduate courses being taught on an overload basis, the absence of adequate academic oversight, the lack of appropriate planning, and the need for greater academic support services. Repeatedly found among institutional deficiencies which must be addressed as part of accreditation requirements, graduate education has been the focus of numerous subsequent follow-up evaluations and institutional reports stipulated for the purpose of measuring institutional progress in responding to the Commission's concerns.

It is the Commission's repeated finding that strong graduate programs, as intended by its standards for accreditation, cannot be established and maintained on a "pay-as-you-go" basis given the levels of tuition charged by the public institutions. I would hasten to point out that the Commission does not believe that the solution is to be found in increasing tuitions. Most problems, if not all, would remain. Rather, the Commission believes that there is a need for regular substantial funding for graduate programming from the Commonwealth if the colleges are going to achieve and exceed expected levels of performance. Without it, given the long-standing nature and intensity of the problem, serious questions must be raised about established and future graduate programs as the Commission continues its review of public institutions. The institutions, themselves, the Commission has concluded, have nearly achieved the limits of what they can do alone.

2. Excerpt from Business Administration and Management: Current Trends and Future Directions by Dr. William C. Flewellen, Jr., University Professor of Industrial Development, University of Georgia - March 1986.

Note: This review covers both undergraduate and graduate programs. Only the University of Massachusetts/Amherst's program is accredited by AACSB (American Assembly of Collegiate Schools of Business).

State Colleges (page 37)

- 6.21 The requirement that graduate programs be self-supporting must be addressed. Because of this dichotomy, the regular business faculty cannot teach as part of their normal load in the graduate program. Much of the teaching is carried out by part-time faculty. No new graduate programs should be initiated until they can be offered by the business faculty as state supported programs. No school with such a self-sustaining graduate program can hope for accreditation until this issue is resolved.

If the problem is not resolved in three years, it is recommended that graduate programs in business be eliminated from the state colleges, despite the need for graduate programs of high quality to serve students across the state.

Programs (page 73)

The present MBA and other masters in business should not be continued at their present inadequate level of quality. They should be given immediate attention. Problems include: 1) appropriate funding to assure adequate funding of faculty and resources, 2) funding for faculty support services, 3) the general posture toward research, 4) attitudes toward teaching at more than one institution, 5) separation of the graduate program from the business program and the requirement that the graduate program be self-sustaining.

Faculty (Pages 74 and 75)

In collegiate education for business the Ph.D. degree in business or a closely related field is recognized as terminal for teaching business courses. The J.D. degree is recognized as terminal for teaching business law. At this minimum level for accreditation only 50 percent of the FTE faculty needed have terminal degrees for undergraduate programs and 75 percent for masters programs.

The state colleges reported 112.2 FTE faculty in 1983-83. Only 14.8 (13 percent) held terminal degrees.

3. Excerpts from Nursing Education in Massachusetts: Current Trends and Future Directions by Dr. Sylvia Hart, Dean of the College of Nursing, University of Tennessee, June, 1984.

Note: This review focused largely on undergraduate programs.

Page 2:

5. The organizational structure that currently places all evening programs under the administrative jurisdiction of the Continuing Education division should be evaluated and modified.
4. Excerpts from Teacher Education in Massachusetts (The Public Sector): A Report for the Board of Regents of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts by Daniel E. Griffith, Special Assistant to the Chancellor, New York University, Chairman of the Review Team.

Page 13:

Graduate education is plagued with a number of ills. The practice of locating graduate education with the Division of Continuing Education, as is the case in the state colleges, should be rectified immediately.

Page 14:

Although the visiting team is composed of educators with long and varied experience not one of them knows of a state which handles graduate education the way it is handled in Massachusetts. It is a situation which should be remedied immediately.

The team is concerned that far too many graduate programs are poorly staffed. The practice appears to get a master's or doctoral program approved and then try to find a staff. The practice should be reversed and no graduate program should be allowed to start until the faculty has reached the appropriate size and quality.

Pages 15 and 16:

Recommendation #11

The team recommends that a set of standards be adopted by the Board of Regents and that graduate programs be terminated in those institutions unable or unwilling to meet the standards.

Recommendation #13

There should be an immediate freeze on all new graduate programs. Programs not in operation as of September 1, 1985 should not be allowed to start until adequate and qualified faculty members are in place.

APPENDIX C

Charge to Task Force

BOARD OF REGENTS OF HIGHER EDUCATION

REQUEST FOR BOARD ACTION

COMMITTEE: PLANNING AND RESOURCE DEVELOPMENT

NO. PP 8- #1

DATE: February 3, 1987

MOVED:

RESOLUTION

WHEREAS the fundamental mission of public higher education is to serve the citizens of the Commonwealth through courses and degree programs that conform to systemwide standards of access and quality; and

WHEREAS the Commonwealth does not financially support many graduate, evening, weekend and summer courses and degree programs, and

WHEREAS such courses and programs are critical to extending higher education opportunities to segments of our population that are growing; and

WHEREAS the Regents' program reviews and many accrediting and professional association review committees have stated that the present practice of nonsupport adversely affects both the accessibility of these programs and their quality; and

WHEREAS the purpose and function of the Board of Regents under Section 1 of Chapter 15A of the General Laws is to develop, foster, and advocate a comprehensive system of public higher education of high quality, flexibility, responsiveness and accountability which will enable citizens of the Commonwealth to choose among a broad spectrum of educational programs which respond to changing economic factors, social needs and student populations; and

WHEREAS pursuant to Section 3 of Chapter 15A of the General Laws, the Board of Regents is the governing authority of the system of public institutions of higher education; and

WHEREAS the Board of Regents acting pursuant to Section 5 of Chapter 15A of the General Laws is responsible for analyzing the present and future goals, needs and requirements of public higher education in the Commonwealth in order to achieve a well-coordinated quality system.

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Chancellor of the Board of Regents of Higher Education be authorized and directed to convene a Commission and, pursuant to the charge which is attached, study all of the issues associated with what is commonly called "Continuing Education" and make appropriate recommendations to the Board of Regents for approval.

CHARGE TO THE TASK FORCE

Pursuant to the attached resolution, the Task Force is charged to review, evaluate and, where appropriate, recommend changes in the present practice of providing evening, summer, weekend and graduate degree programs at no cost to the Commonwealth through divisions or programs in Continuing Education. Specifically, the Task Force is charged with the following tasks:

1. To carefully review and evaluate existing Continuing Education Programs, undergraduate and graduate, in relation to state-supported degree programs and to compare their quality and accessibility.
2. To develop policy guidelines, consistent with the missions and goals of public higher education, delineating the respective spheres and functions in which self-supporting and state-supported programs are appropriate.
3. To review relevant statutory language and regulations and, where appropriate, recommend changes to accommodate state support for courses and programs offered in the evening, summer and weekends.
4. To review and make recommendations concerning the implications, if any, of state support for certain Continuing Education courses and programs for the collective bargaining contracts with public higher education faculty and staff.
5. To establish appropriate guidelines, evaluation and review procedures and timetables for implementing the Task Force's recommendations.
6. Where courses or degree programs are recommended for state support, the Task Force should estimate the cost associated with such support and should be mindful of the need to be cost effective in any recommended conversion.

The Regents will provide staff support for the Task Force. The members of the Task Force will be asked to meet at least monthly to review issue papers and other research provided by staff, to take testimony as necessary in furtherance of their review and evaluation, and to issue their recommendations no later than June 30, 1987. At the discretion of the Task Force, it may hold hearings in various parts of the Commonwealth to solicit the views of the public.

APPENDIX D

Locations of State Colleges

MASSACHUSETTS

State Colleges with Graduate Programs



